

To: "Chuck Vogelsang" <chuckv@water.ca.gov>
Subject: Re: need for some references

this concerns "growth"

In response to your request below, I have found two somewhat pertinent articles which I will fax to you. They are:

Gilbert, Jerome H. 1992. Water Supply and Land Use Planning: Respecting the Boundaries. Land Use Forum. 1(5) P. 338. Fall 1992.

Cohen, Andrew. 1992. Water Supply and Land use Planning: Making the Connection. Land Use Forum. 1(5) P. 341. Fall 1992.

Both of these articles focus on relationships between a districts' total water supplies and growth. They note that total water supplies have not limited growth because 1) there is generally no legal connection, and 2) growth can occur with limited supplies because growth merely results in less water supply reliability during dry periods.

Our (my) major argument is somewhat different. I claim that CALFED supplies will not induce growth because they are one supply option of many options. I claim that the total amount of water supply in a district can grow with or without CALFED supplies. I think this is an empirical issue that will not be resolved by theory or literature. It merely depends on the mix of supply options available to a district. If CALFED supplies are the only option, then my two summary points from Gilbert and Cohen would still apply.

My claim is that CALFED supplies are not the only option. In fact, every major district I know of has their own plans for meeting future demands that do not include CALFED supplies. Therefore, the appropriate citations are the planning documents of these districts that show how future growth could be met without CALFED. I have provided relevant citations below. The issue for these districts is not whether CALFED supplies will be available so they can grow, but rather, what is the cost and quality of CALFED supplies in comparison to other supply options.

Man, Debra, 1995. Metropolitan Water District of Southern California. Integrated Resources Plan. Executive Summary. Transmitted To: Board of Directors. December 26.

EBMUD, 1999. WSMP:Meeting East Bay Water Demands. www.ebmud.com/ebmwsid/demand.htm

Camp, Dresser, McKee et al. 1994. Zone 7 Alameda County Flood Control and Water Conservation District Water Supply Planning Report. January.

Alameda County Water District, 1995. Integrated Resources Planning Study Summary Report. August.

Contra Costa Water District. 1996. Future Water Supply Study Executive Summary. Final Report, August.

Ruby, Sarah et al. 1996. Santa Clara Valley Water District Urban Water Management Plan. March.

I'll keep these in a nice pile in case someone wants copies.

-----Original Message-----

From: Chuck Vogelsang <chuckv@water.ca.gov>

To: rmecon@mother.com <rmecon@mother.com>

Date: Friday, January 28, 2000 2:58 PM

Subject: need for some references

Roger, below is a section from the response to comments on growth. The legal staff has asked that we provide some sources to be put in the administrative record. Do you have some literature cites or studies that provide backup for these arguments? I need copies as well. thanks.

Persuasive arguments can be made that CALFED water supplies are not likely to

induce growth because 1) some CALFED supplies would be used to increase reliability for existing uses in dry years, and 2) the CALFED supplies would merely replace other supplies that would be used instead to accommodate growth. Without CALFED, the next most expensive increment of water supply (or demand reduction) would be taken and the amount of growth will be unaffected. Additionally, improved water supply reliability to agricultural areas where water supplies are chronically short of demands could improve the likelihood of agricultural lands remaining in agricultural use and not being used for urban development. On the other hand, CALFED supplies might induce growth if a local government passes an ordinance prohibiting growth without new water supplies, and there are no other supplies available. This seems unlikely because the M&I users who would receive the CALFED supplies have access to major conveyance systems. The potential for water transfers from other water users means that some other supply is potentially available. Another case where growth could be caused occurs if CALFED supplies are less expensive than the alternative, and this lower expense encourages urbanization. The counter-argument to this exception is that the cost of water is not an important part of the cost of home development, ownership, or the cost of living. Therefore, the cost of CALFED supplies is likely to be an insignificant influence on urban growth. Both arguments can be supported by (what? Sources needed as "substantial evidence" to be placed in administrative record, per legal)